



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,440	08/08/2001	Hideki Matsunaga	110331	9076
25944	7590	08/10/2007		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER LY, ANH	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/923,440

Applicant(s)

MATSUNAGA, HIDEKI

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 06/22 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is response to Applicants' RESPONSE filed on 06/22/2007.
2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this Application.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 06/22/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that, "the identifier associated with the object in a one-to-one relationship ... Bendik to remedy this shortfall." (page 1 the last paragraph, the remark).

Examiner respectfully disagrees as argued. In response to Applicants arguments, Bendik teaches relationship of the document, on the basis one-to-one relationship, being created and other documents or files that are associated with (sections 0072-0073).

Applicant argued that, "Kanai does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggest, at least the features of defined a retrieval condition for retrieving an object, the retrieval condition being defined based on at least one attribute of the object." (page 2, the first paragraph, the remark).

Examiner respectfully disagrees as argued. In response to Applicants arguments, Kanai teaches attribute of an object such as a document based on the creation date, creator or location of the document, which is a retrieval object for a document (sections 0010 and 0014). Also, the retrieval condition for a document is defined in the XML or metadata format (sections 0016-0017; 0066-0067 and 0073-0074).

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 7-13 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2005/0149572 A1 of Kanai et al. (hereinafter Kanai) (continuation of Application No.: 09/532,535, filed on MAR. 22, 2000) in view of Pub. No.: US 20020020046224 A1 of Bendik. (continuation of Application No.: 09/378,785, filed on AUG. 23, 1999).

6. With respect to claim 1, Kanai teaches an object management method for performing access control for a stored object (a method and apparatus for retrieving document stored in the storage device via access control information and access right on the documents or objects to the user(s): fig. 4, sections 0047 and 0010, and 0014-0017), the method comprising the steps of:

defining a retrieval condition for retrieving an object, the retrieval condition being defined based on at least one attribute of the object (when a user to search the stored document, user may send a request with retrieval condition defined in the XML format

Art Unit: 2162

based on the attribute of the object such as creation date, author (document can be retrieved base on the attribute value(s) or properties of the document: sections 0014-0019);

setting an access right in association with the retrieval condition (access control to the stored document based on the users' access right (permission rights to access stored document) for a particular document's attribute (section 0014 0017 0019-0020); and

in response to an access request from a user for the object matching the retrieval condition and identifier; performing access control, in response to a request, for the object matching retrieval condition and identifier on the basis of the access right (performing the access request base on the right of access of user to the objects matching the conditions being set on the request in XML format and the key of the document: see fig. 4, and sections 0047-0050).

Kanai teaches setting access right or permission rights to access the document based on the attribute of document such as the attributes of the document including its title, author, and the date saved; defining identifier for identifying the document and performing access control for the document based on the level of access to the stored document (fig. 4). Kanai does not clearly teach setting an identifier for identifying the object, the identifier associated with the object in a one-to-one relationship.

However, Bendik teaches generating unique document identifier for the document (abstract, sections 0072-0073).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kanai with the teachings of Bendik. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of unique document identifier for the object as disclosed (Bendik's abstract and section 0072), into the system of Kanai for the purpose of enabling user(s) who can gain access to the document in repository from a computer having access to the network, thereby, helping to quick access to the stored document (Bendik's section 0001 and 0004).

With respect to claim 2, Kanai teaches performing a check, when request for access to an object occurs, to see whether the object meets the retrieval condition and controlling access to the access-requested object on the basis of the access right that has been set in association with the retrieval condition (abstract, section 0014, 0017-0020).

With respect to claim 3, Kanai teaches a method as discussed in claim 1.

Kanai teaches setting access right or permission rights to access the document based on the attribute of document such as the attributes of the document including its title, author, and the date saved; defining identifier for identifying the document and performing access control for the document based on the level of access to the stored document (fig. 4). Kanai does not clearly teach the identifier of the object has been set.

However, Bendik teaches generating unique document identifier for the document (abstract, sections 0072-0073).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kanai with the teachings of Bendik. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of unique document identifier for the object as disclosed (Bendik's abstract and section 0072), into the system of Kanai for the purpose of enabling user(s) who can gain access to the document in repository from a computer having access to the network, thereby, helping to quick access to the stored document (Bendik's section 0001 and 0004).

performing a check, when request for access to an object occurs, to see whether the object meets the retrieval condition and controlling access to the access-requested object on the basis of the access right that has been set in association with the retrieval condition (abstract, section 0014, 0017-0020).

With respect to claim 4, Kanai teaches the identifier is changed according to need when addition, modification, or deletion of the object identified by the identifier is made (sections 0083 and 0085).

With respect to claim 7, Kanai teaches wherein the object is stored with attribute data, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data (sections 0019-0020).

With respect to claim 8, Kanai teaches wherein the object is stored with attribute data and a method for referring to an entity of the object, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data and the entity of the object referred to by the method (sections 0014 and 0017; also see abstract; also 0047).

With respect to claim 9, Kanai teaches wherein the access right is a specification about a user and an access type allowed to access the object (sections 0050, 0052 and 0088).

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 7 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 7 hereinabove.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 8 hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 9 hereinabove.

7. Claims 5-6 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2005/0149572 A1 of Kanai et al. (hereinafter Kanai) (continuation of Application No.: 09/532,535, filed on MAR. 22, 2000) in view of Pub. No.: US 20020020046224 A1 of Bendik (continuation of Application No.: 09/378,785, filed on AUG. 23, 1999) and further in view of US Patent No.: 6,850,893 B2 issued to Lipkin et al. (hereinafter Lipkin) (provisional application No.: 60/176,153, filed on JAN. 14, 2000).

With respect to claims 5-6, Kanai in view of Bendik discloses a system as discussed in claim 1.

Kanai and Bendik disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Kanai and Bendik do not teach on the basis of OR and AND condition.

However, Lipkin teaches However, Lipkin teaches Boolean Operators OR and AND (col. 120, lines 45-65, col. 124, lines 12-20, lines 55-65 and col. 126, lines 1-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kanai in view of Bendik with the teachings of Lipkin. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of Boolean operations in the retrieval condition for an object as disclosed (Lipkin's abstract col. 120, lines 45-65 and col. 124, lines 12-20), into the

Art Unit: 2162

system of Kanai for the purpose of managing security on the document(s) of the data process system, thereby, allowing a system administrator to define the retrieval condition for a document to be retrieved on the system (Lipkin's col. 1, lines 35-41 and col. 2, lines 5-15).

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2162

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV (Written Authorization being given by Applicant (MPEP 502.03 [R-2])) or fax to (571) 273-4039 (Examiner's personal Fax No.). The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Breene**, can be reached on (571) 272-4107.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: **Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300**

ANH LY 
AUG. 6th, 2007


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER